

Order 2003 Proposed Amendment of MCR 5.125(C)(6)(f)

I believe the rule may be too broad as written. It would arguably require service on a surety in all cases where an accounting is before a court. While a surety should receive notice if their interest may be adversely affected, I do not believe the rule should require that they be noticed in all cases. I would change the proposed language to read as follows:

(f) such other persons whose interests may be adversely affected by the relief requested, including insurers.

--

Phillip E. Harter, Probate Judge
Calhoun County Probate Court
Calhoun County Justice Center, 161 E. Michigan Ave.
Battle Creek, Michigan 49014-4066
<http://courts.co.calhoun.mi.us/>